

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,371	08/01/2003	Scott A. Webb	5259-14600	5117
35690	7590 11/10/2005		EXAMINER	
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.			REIMERS, ANNETTE R	
P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3733	

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		The Thin				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/633,371	WEBB ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Annette R. Reimers	3733				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by si Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re the riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tatute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _						
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice und	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-59,74,75 and 86-88</u> is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-59, 74, 75, and 86-88</u> are subjected so	drawn from consideration.	requirement.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to b the drawing(s) be held in abeyand rection is required if the drawing(s	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. The sents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No ecceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)	mmary (PTO-413) /Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) -				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-58, drawn to a spinal implant, classified in class 623, subclass 17.11.
- II. Claims 74 and 88, drawn to a method of inserting a rasp in a disc space between vertebrae and inserting an implant, classified in class 606, subclass 85.
- III. Claims 59, 75 and 86-87, drawn to an implant kit, classified in class 606, subclass 99.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the implant can be used to practice another and materially different process, e.g. inserting an implant into a space formed using a reamer apparatus.

Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the implant kit can be used to practice another and materially

different process, e.g. the implant kit can be used to insert an implant in a totally different area of the body, such as the hip or the knee.

Inventions III and I are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed, because the implant of the kit does not require a body comprising a top and a bottom, each of which comprise radially positioned protrusions, wherein the top protrusions near the anterior side are finer than the top protrusions near the posterior side, and wherein the bottom protrusions near the anterior side are coarser than the bottom protrusions near the posterior side. The subcombination has separate utility, such as a spinal implant.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, and the search required for Group I is not required for Group III or Group III, and vice versa, and the search required for Group II is not required for Group III, and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/633,371

Art Unit: 3733

Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct

species of the claimed invention:

Species (Rasp)

I. Figure 6A

II. Figure 6B

Subspecies (Guide)

I. Figure 10

II. Figure 12

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for

prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is

finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims appear to be generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification

of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims

readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless

accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration

of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the

elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/633,371 Page 5

Art Unit: 3733

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Annette R. Reimers whose telephone number is (571) 272-7135. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/633,371

Art Unit: 3733

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR

EDUARDO C. FOBERT PRIMARY EXAMINER